

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 6 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 is independent. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to address a number of informalities. Withdrawal of the claim objections is requested.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In rejecting claim 1, the examiner stated:

In claim 1, item B, referring to the phrase "... maximum-sized frame satisfying the most stringent quality of service requirement...", the specification does not describe this feature in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to determine how a maximum-sized frame can satisfy the most stringent quality of service requirement.

The applicant respectfully disagrees. On page 1, lines 13-16 of the specification, the applicant states that "wireless ATM has been envisioned as a potential framework for next-generation wireless networks capable of supporting integrated multimedia services with a wide range of services rates and *different quality of service (QoS)*." (emphasis added). The applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a communication channel of a wireless ATM network can support different levels of quality of service, each defined by a respective set of known parameters. The applicant further submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that frame size affects parameters such as throughput, a characteristic by which a quality of service requirement may be defined.

On page 2, line 24 – page 3, lines 1 of the specification, the applicant stated:

[T]he media access control method of the present invention is used in local wireless ATM networks to *guarantee the quality of service by dynamically [controlling] the size of the frame.*" (emphasis added).

It is the applicant's belief that one of ordinary skill in the art reviewing at least the above cited portion of the applicant's specification would have understood that frame size can be varied by the wireless ATM network in accordance with a quality of service requirement, and in the case of multiple quality of service requirements, frame size can be configured to satisfy the most

stringent of the multiple quality of service requirements. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The applicant believes the amendments to claim 1 overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/15/05



Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906